



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,911	12/26/2001	Dong Jae You	8733.543.00	7511

30827 7590 07/02/2007
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

SANTIAGO, MARICELI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2879

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

07/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/025,911	YOU, DONG JAE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mariceli Santiago	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/21/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on February 20, 2007, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Cancellation of claims 3, 6-17 and 19 has been entered.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 18 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Woofter et al. (US 3,125,299).

Regarding claim 1, Woofter discloses a lamp apparatus (Figs. 13-14), comprising a lamp (74) capable of using a discharge of an external voltage applied to an electrode (75) of the lamp to generate light for the liquid crystal display, a wire to deliver the external voltage to the lamp, and an L-shaped connector (78) for electrically connecting the electrode of the lamp to the wire, the L-shaped connector (78) directly contacting the electrode (at 77) of the lamp and a portion of the wire (at 79), wherein the L-shaped connector includes a first curved wing (77, Fig. 14) to be pressed around the electrode of the lamp, and a second curved wing (79, Fig. 14) to be pressed around a portion of the wire, wherein the first curved wing and the second curved wing are integrally formed.

The recitation "for a liquid crystal" is considered an intended used recitation. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed element is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed element from a prior art structure satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Regarding claims 2 and 4, Woofter discloses a lamp apparatus comprising a unifying means (81) for integrally¹ forming the power terminal of the lamp and the wire electrically connected to each other via the connector.

The recitation to "injection molded product" is considered to be directed to a method of manufacturing the product, accordingly, it is not considered not germane to the issue of patentability of the claimed device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,799,987).

Regarding claim 1, Park discloses a lamp apparatus (Figs. 5-6), comprising a lamp (2) capable of using a discharge of an external voltage applied to an electrode (8) of the lamp to generate light, a wire (4) to deliver the external voltage to the lamp, and an L-shaped connector (78) for electrically connecting the electrode of the lamp to the wire, the L-shaped connector (22) directly contacting the electrode (at 22A, or 24A) of the lamp and a portion of the wire (at

¹ consisting or composed of parts that together constitute a whole

Art Unit: 2879

22B or 24B), wherein the L-shaped connector includes a first wing (22A, 24A) to be pressed around the electrode of the lamp, and a second wing (22B, 24B) to be pressed around a portion of the wire, wherein the first wing and the second wing are integrally formed.

Park fails to explicitly state the first wing and the second wings being curved, however, Park states that the first and second wings are crimped² around the electrode and the wire elements respectively, thus providing a secured connection. Moreover, Park exemplifies in the embodiment shown in Fig. 3, wherein wing sections (18C, 18A) contacting the electrode and the wire have curved profiles conforming to the shaped of the electrode and the wire, which may also be crimped around the electrode and wire. It is considered within the capability of one skilled in the art to provide curved-shaped wings conforming to the shape of the electrode and wire components, as an obvious matter of design engineering as evidenced by the embodiment shown in Fig. 3. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate curved-shaped wings as exemplified in the embodiment of Fig. 3 of Park as an obvious matter of design engineering, in order to provide securing means conforming with the respective shape of the electrode and wire components.

The recitation "for a liquid crystal" is considered an intended used recitation. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed element is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed element from a prior art structure satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Regarding claims 2 and 4, Park discloses a lamp apparatus comprising a unifying means (6) for integrally³ forming the power terminal of the lamp and the wire electrically connected to each other via the connector.

² To bend or mold (leather) into shape

³ consisting or composed of parts that together constitute a whole

The recitation to "injection molded product" is considered to be directed to a method of manufacturing the product, accordingly, it is not considered not germane to the issue of patentability of the claimed device.

Claim 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,799,987) in view of Yamashita et al. (JP 09-259749 A).

Regarding claims 5 and 18, Park exemplifies the limitation of the unifying means (6) being provided around the lamp and the wire. However, Park fails to exemplify the limitation of the material for the unifying means being selected from the group consisting of plastic or silicon. In the same field of endeavor, Yamashita discloses a lamp apparatus provided with unifying means (7) made of a plastic material ([0008], [0011]). It is considered within the capabilities of one skilled in the art the selection of a material based on its known suitability for an intended application as an obvious matter of design engineering. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to use plastic material for the unifying means, since the selection of known materials for a known purpose is within the skill of the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2879

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariceli Santiago whose telephone number is (571) 272-2464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Mariceli Santiago
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2879